

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated June 10, 2009, and in accordance with the telephone interview courteously granted to Applicant's representative on August 11, 2009. Claims 1 to 25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 10, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 24 have been amended. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 to cover the cost of any fees due in connection with this Response.

As a result of the telephone interview, the Examiner acknowledged that he would withdraw the finality of the Office Action and asked us to file this Response After Final. Accordingly, Applicant has submitted this Response without a Request for Continued Examination. Applicant respectfully requests confirmation of such withdrawal and entrance of this Response.

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More particularly, the Office Action states that the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Office Action asserts that the following claimed language "said change is of an amount which is determined based on the selected different second component of the wager for the play of the base game and regardless of the total wager value of the wager placed" is not adequately described in the specification.

Applicant submits that the support for this element can at least be found on page 21, lines 10 to 15 of the specification and on pages 24 to 26 of the specification.

For example, at Page 21, lines 10 to 15, the specification states:

In one embodiment, the number of moves along the meter is based on the number of credits wagered per payline. In one embodiment, the number of moves along the meter is equal to the credits wagered per payline.

Pages 24 to 26 of the specification describe the example embodiment illustrated in Figs. 7 to 10 of the present application. In the example of Figs. 7 to 10, each time the player obtains a bonus symbol as a result of a spin of the reels, the gaming device

decrements (or changes) the meter by the number of credits wagered per payline (i.e., the second wager component). For ease of illustration, the table provided below summarizes the wagering structure and the amount by which the meter changes for each of the four spins of the reels in the example of Figs. 7 to 10.

TABLE

Spin	# Lines wagered	Wager amount per line	total wager value	Amount of change in meter
1	5	3	15	3
2	5	5	25	5
3	5	2	10	2
4	5	2	10	2

As illustrated above, for the first spin, the player selects to wager on five lines and separately selects to wager three credits per line. The total wager value for each spin is calculated based on a player-selected number of lines wagered (i.e., the first component of the wager) and the player-selected wager per line (i.e., the second component of the wager). Thus, the total wager value for the first spin is fifteen. If, as a result of the first spin, the player obtains the bonus symbol, the amount by which the meter changes is based on the selected different second component of the wager for the play of the base game and regardless of the total wager value of the wager placed. For example, for the first spin, the amount of the change in the meter is three since the player wagered three credits per line. Although the player wagered a total of fifteen credits on the first spin, the amount by which the meter changes is based on the selected second wager component (i.e., the credits per payline) regardless of the total wager value.

Applicant submits that at least these portions of the specification provide sufficient support for the amount by which the meter changes being based on the selected different second component of the wager for the play of the base game and

regardless of the total wager value of the wager placed. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 5, 11 to 14, 16, and 21 to 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,168,523 to Piechowiak ("Piechowiak") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0045474 to Singer ("Singer").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended certain of the claims for clarification purposes. If the Examiner would like to discuss further clarifications to the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

As discussed during the interview, Piechowiak discloses a gaming system which includes a plurality of linked gaming machines connected to a common controller. In one embodiment, the gaming system is associated with a bonus feature where the generation of combinations of bonus symbols (i.e., bonus hits) causes the controller to build up a pooled bonus value based upon the values of the combinations of bonus symbols generated by the linked gaming devices. When a player playing at one of the linked gaming devices obtains a bonus hit which causes the pooled bonus value to meet or exceed a predetermined threshold value, a bonus award is provided to the player who caused the threshold value to be exceeded. In another embodiment (illustrated in Fig. 6), each time one of the players playing at one of the linked gaming devices obtains a bonus hit, an accumulated bonus count is incremented by one. The first gaming device to cause the bonus count to reach a threshold value provides a bonus award to the player of that gaming device.

Singer discloses a gaming device which includes an "amount bet per line" meter which displays to a player the number of credits that have been wagered per payline (Paragraph 31).

The Office Action acknowledges that Piechowiak does not disclose that, each time a change of the meter occurs during the bonus game, the change is based on the second component of the wager in the base game. The Office Action asserts that Singer teaches a meter which displays to the player the amount wagered per payline. The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to modify Piechowiak with a bet-per-line meter to quickly and efficiently tell the user how much is being wagered per payline.

As agreed upon during the interview, regardless of whether it would have been obvious to modify Piechowiak to include a bet-per-line meter, the gaming device resulting from the combination of Piechowiak and Singer does not achieve the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1. More specifically, Piechowiak and Singer, either alone or in combination, do not disclose a plurality of instructions, which when executed by the at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with the at least one display device and the at least one input device to: (c) if the player selects at least a threshold amount for the first component of the wager for the play of the base game and the displayed outcome for the play of the base game includes a designated outcome, trigger a bonus game associated with a meter displayed in the bonus game, the meter being changeable each time the bonus game is triggered, wherein: (i) each time the bonus game triggered, the meter is at a displayed predetermined level, and (ii) each time a change of the meter occurs during the bonus game, the change is of an amount which is determined based on the selected different second component of the wager for the play of the base game and regardless of the total wager value of the wager placed and any outcome which occurs in the play of the base game; and (d) when the meter reaches a designated level, provide an award generation event associated with the meter to the player.

In the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1, on the other hand, the plurality of instructions, when executed by the at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with the at least one display device and the at least one input device to: (c) if the player selects at least a threshold amount for the first component of the wager for the play of the base game and the displayed outcome for the play of the base game includes a designated outcome, trigger a bonus game associated with a meter displayed in the bonus game, the meter being changeable each time the bonus game is triggered, wherein: (i) each time the bonus game triggered, the meter is at a displayed predetermined level, and (ii) each time a change of the meter occurs during the bonus game, the change is of an amount which is determined based on the selected different second component of the wager for the play of the base game and regardless

of the total wager value of the wager placed and any outcome which occurs in the play of the base game; and (d) when the meter reaches a designated level, provide an award generation event associated with the meter to the player.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are each patentably distinguished over Piechowiak and Singer.

For reasons similar to those given above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 16 and 21 and the claims depending therefrom are each patentably distinguished over Piechowiak and Singer.

The Office Action rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Piechowiak, in view of Singer, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,186,894 to Mayeroff. Applicant respectfully submits that the patentability of amended independent Claim 1 renders this rejection moot.

The Office Action rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Piechowiak, in view of Singer, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,823,873 to Moody. Applicant respectfully submits that the patentability of amended independent Claim 1 renders this rejection moot.

The Office Action rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Piechowiak, in view of Singer, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,976 to Schneider. Applicant respectfully submits that the patentability of amended independent Claim 1 renders this rejection moot.


The Office Action rejected Claims 15, 20, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Piechowiak, in view of Singer, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,925 to Giobbi. Applicant respectfully submits that the patentability of amended independent Claims 1, 16 and 21 renders this rejection moot.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATES LLP

BY


Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Customer No.: 29159

Dated: August 17, 2009